

Saint Louis University Public Law Review

Volume 34

Number 1 *United We Stand or United We Fall:
The Reunification of St. Louis City and County*
(Volume XXXIV, No. 1)

Article 4

2014

Keynote Address

Senator Richard Lugar

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lugar, Senator Richard (2014) "Keynote Address," *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*: Vol. 34 : No. 1
, Article 4.

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr/vol34/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Saint Louis University Public Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarship Commons. For more information, please contact [Susie Lee](#).

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR*

Thank you all for coming today for what I believe will be a wonderful meeting of minds and hearts in this great city and this great county. I am indebted to Dean Wolff and the School of Law. I have been especially moved by the words of Mayor Slay and County Executive Dooley. I am especially moved by the attendance today of all of you.

My story begins with the fact that as a young member of the Indianapolis Rotary Club—I had been inducted while I was still in the Navy out of honor of my father, who was a very active Rotarian—I met every Tuesday with 500 leaders in Indianapolis who were wonderful mentors as my brother and I tried to resurrect our family business manufacturing food machinery on the west side and a 604-acre farm on the southwest side of the county. It was a struggle for us. We were so preoccupied with the factory and the farm, we really were almost oblivious of what was going on in the general community around us until people on the west side came to our office one day and said, “Our kids are just getting dirt. We really are not being treated at all well and we need you, Lugar, to run for the school board.”

To be truthful, I did not know where the school board met or exactly what it did. I was flattered that anyone was interested enough to come to the factory and implore that I go down there and fight the good fight. And so, as a result, I did decide to run for the school board, an elective office, in 1964. I found out quickly that Indianapolis was in the midst of a civil rights revolution. I found that all sorts of divisions were occurring and all sorts of people came out to run for the school board. There had never been such a school board election before. I emerged from that second best. An African American lady, Gertrude Page, the widow of a businessman in the near inner city, was the chief vote-getter.

Right away we saw what we had in front of us. The federal government had proposed a very modest school breakfast program for latchkey children.

* President, Lugar Center; Professor of Practice and Distinguished Scholar, Indiana University School of Global and International Studies; Visiting Distinguished Professor, Georgetown University Global Public Policy Institute. This transcript was derived from Senator Lugar’s keynote address at the *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*’s symposium entitled *United We Stand or United We Fall: The Reunification of St. Louis City and County*, held on February 28, 2014 at Saint Louis University School of Law.

These were people described as persons whose parents were gone before they went to school. They received no breakfast. They often were sick and sometimes did not get to school. It seemed to me obvious and humane that we should avail ourselves of that opportunity to help feed those children. But my goodness, all hell broke loose. The Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce said, "We have never accepted a dime of federal aid in this city. How dare you breach that division between the federal authorities who want to dominate us by sending their money out here?" That was rather earthshaking. And then Stan Evans, the editorial writer of the *Indianapolis News*, went in and said, "Something subversive at work is going down there at the school board these days. We are being undermined altogether in terms of federal aid."

To make a long story short, by a split vote, the board voted to get the children the breakfast. This led to one thing after another, which is how I realized we had a very racially segregated school system in a country that was moving clearly away from that, thank goodness. So as a result, I initiated what became known as the Shortridge Plan. Shortridge was the high school that I had attended and was a lovely place with lots of people receiving college preparatory work. The thought behind the Shortridge Plan was that we would allow every child, wherever that child lived in Indianapolis, to attend Shortridge High School if they wanted to do so, and they would be prepared for college. It was a voluntary desegregation move and it happened. The first year, Shortridge was to become 95% African American and 5% Caucasian. This occurred just fifteen years from the time that I had attended when it was 100% Caucasian. It came to 50-50 in terms of people who were entering, voluntarily desegregating a very large part. It was too good to be true. The situation meandered on and in due course, Indianapolis, like many other cities, found desegregation through court order and what have you. But in any event, these were early adventures.

Now I mention these because in the midst of all of this, I had an opportunity to come to St. Louis. It was a breathtaking opportunity because as a Rotarian, I had advanced by this time to the board and secretary of the club. The other officers did not want to come to the convention, Rotary International, so they sent me with the ten votes of the Indianapolis Delegation. My wife, Charlene, and I found a motel about ten miles out of town because all the hotels were taken by the time we were designated. We drove in each day to the sessions. We saw Willie Brandt, who was then the mayor of West Berlin amidst all of the struggle there with the reunification. We saw Chuck Percy, who became a Senator and with whom I worked on the Formulations Committee for many, many years. We saw Erwin Canon with the *Christian Science Monitor*—all sorts of great people. It was a tremendous, inspirational experience for me in terms of broadening the scope beyond the struggles we

were having in Indianapolis with the school lunches or desegregation or how to pay for the schools.

I mention all of this because an opportunity came. The Republican Party came along. The Republicans had not been elected to the mayor business for well over a generation in Indianapolis, and given the demographics it was unlikely anybody was going to be elected for another generation. But the Republican Party had a shakeup. A new organization came in and they had a selection committee right outside the primary. They decided I would be their best bet to try to upset the incumbent Democratic mayor. As a result, we ran for mayor and we were successful.

I will just say, at the outset, that as I prepared for that situation, I began to envision Indianapolis as a world-class city. All the way through the election, I gave the impression that we were on the threshold of really a revolution of ideas and growth and beauty, without being very specific as to how this was going to occur. Having won the election, which in itself was an upset, we began to work. Now I do not advise the way that we proceeded as the way St. Louis and St. Louis County should proceed for a moment, nor do I really want to offer the slightest criticism for how things are proceeding here.

I just simply mention, from personal experience, that I brought together a fairly small group. A man by the name of John Burkhart, an insurance executive, and his wife had a beautiful home on the north side of Indianapolis. They were our host and hostess for meetings that included the Republican county chairman, the head of the city council, someone who was working in the county government but who was also an active politician, two very able lawyers, and maybe two or three other persons who I trusted. We began to envision what we had hoped Indianapolis and Marion County were going to look like fairly shortly with a session of the legislature coming up the following year.

The legislature was in parody because Indianapolis legally is a creature of the state of Indiana. We did not have the authority to rewrite all of our rules or our structure. We needed legislation passing both houses and signed by the governor to restructure the whole business. So we were aiming for that legislature, and then specifically the drafting of legislation—a very complex subject, which is why the two lawyers were very important—because we commenced the drafting of Unigov. That meant the repeal of all sorts of things that were in state law that pertained to Indianapolis and Marion County, and the institution of a whole new regime of law.

These conversations were private. To my knowledge, there was no revelation throughout all of the year and we did not want to intrude into the process of the election of 1968, which was a presidential, gubernatorial, and congressional year in Indiana. There were really only a few murmurings in October that something was going on, but no one paid much attention. There

was so much more attention being paid to the elections that year. But then, immediately after the election, I appointed a large task force—as I recall from just rereading the history of Indianapolis, about twenty-nine people—who were largely our major business leaders, including the Chamber of Commerce president, of course. We also brought in all of the members in the Indiana General Assembly Delegation—that is, our state representatives and state senators from the Indianapolis/Marion County area. Finally, we brought in representatives of the African American community and representatives of the media. So this became a larger and larger group of people.

I called them all together into the conference room on the twenty-fifth floor of the City-County building, the mayor's conference room, and we had some very good discussions. But admittedly, the draft of the legislation had already been written. The question then was what modifications people were going to suggest to this or how enthusiastic they were about various sections. There were some good suggestions and there were already some very important objections being voiced by people. Nevertheless, there was a pretty short timeframe between mid-November and the beginning of January when the legislature met.

Now by the time we got to January and the conversation had occurred, an actual bill was introduced by one of the state senators, and the committee process began with hearings in both of the houses. It was a short session that year—just two months in duration—so it had to happen quickly if it was going to occur at all. I will not go through a byplay of all the problems that occurred—they always do in something of this variety—but we had a reasonably good audience in the rest of the legislature, largely because I had toured Indiana during 1968, the election year, visiting not only the Lincoln Day Dinners for Republicans, but likewise rallies for candidates for the legislature. I made it a point to have met with every member of the legislature either in their home counties or cities, or at a breakfast that I had invited them to in Indianapolis, by the time we really got serious in the legislature.

They were not all appreciative of what we were going to do, but on the other hand, many were curious to say the least. They simply had some wonder as to, “Why now? Where comes the impetus for all of this?” In part, it came because after John Gunther and others who wrote about travel in those days described our beautiful city as “Indiana No Place,” this derogatory comment—that this was a mediocre, flat situation of very little interest to anyone outside who was not involved parochially—began to stick. But even then, that was not necessarily enough to convince everybody all over the state that our plan was the best thing that they had ever heard of, so there was quite a struggle.

The amendments that you might suggest came to the fore. Rapidly those who were opposed demanded that it have a referendum attached to it. My own view was that we did not want to have a referendum. I believed that, as a

matter of fact, the people who had been elected to the legislature and the mayor of Indianapolis were already serving the people of Indiana, and that it was really unnecessary to have this intervention. I mention that because histories of unification efforts usually list Indianapolis and I think Winnipeg, Canada as the only two places that succeeded in consolidation without a referendum.

Nevertheless, the referendum was rejected as an idea and it kept bobbing up. There were even some legislators who were very personal about this. One offered an amendment that said the mayor of Indianapolis, namely me, cannot run for another office during his four-year term. Apparently folks felt that as somebody known as the boy Mayor—I had been elected at age thirty-five—I was so aggressive in my own political ambitions that this was just one more step, and they wanted to scotch any thoughts of a gubernatorial or senatorial run during all of this process.

In any event, those amendments were also defeated—our wings were not totally clipped at this state. We, as a matter of fact, had drafted a piece of legislation that avoided most of the objections that have hit most of these consolidation efforts. Specifically, we knew that we had, in Marion County, volunteer fire departments in eight of nine townships. Indianapolis, if you can envision it, is literally a square with nine blocks under the old Northwest Ordinance, laid out six square miles by six square miles in each township. Initially, Indianapolis was set up within a mile square. We were crosshatched—people drawing diagonals across the state—so that the capitol was literally in the center. Many people felt that the mile square was going to be the extent of the city. People began to move outside of the mile square, so it became larger and larger by annexation and so forth.

In any event, we already had a definition problem because we did have these townships, and so we said we were not going to get involved with the fire departments. We would have an Indianapolis fire department and township fire departments. I mention this because the argument has gone on for forty-four years. As a matter of fact, this week when I was in Indianapolis, a committee in the state legislature voted by a count of six to four not to mandate that the last three townships that still have volunteer fire departments join the Indianapolis Fire Department, so they still have just six out of nine townships in the fire department.

But over the course of time, the police department and the sheriff's office combined, which was not a part of the initial legislation but seemed logical after awhile. As is the case in many consolidations, sewer and waterways and sort of vast difficulties of conservation became countywide without too much argument. The school system was deliberately left out of it and is still left out of it. One of the problems that St. Louis has that Indianapolis shares is inner city school facilities that have grave difficulties. As a result, there are several movements for charter schools, for special education of all sorts, for pre-K, and

so forth. These continue as they should, but the school system was not a part of the issue.

So what was left? Well the important fact was that there was going to be one chief executive, the mayor, and one legislative body, the City-County Council as it was called. Initially, the draft was for twenty-five members from single-member districts. This was amended to twenty-nine with four at-large. The thought behind this was that in the election in which the mayor and the council were elected, if the mayor won by a large majority, it was very likely that the four at-large seats would be of the same party. Therefore the mayor would have a majority in the council and could move ahead.

In any event, those were to be the governing parties, and they had really the authority to make it possible for Indianapolis to accept virtually unlimited federal aid. I mention that because after this battle over the school breakfast, and by the time we got Unigov passed, it was apparent that in those days, there were a great number of federal programs in which we had not been involved. We became involved very substantially. That has been true ever since. Indianapolis gets about \$900 to \$1,000 per person in federal aid because of the consolidation situation, as opposed to say Gary, Indiana in the northwest, which gets about \$400 per person. That is quite a difference. And in large part because of the structure and nature of executive and legislative authority, we were eligible for federal aid of all sorts and we applied for it. We participated in about every program I can imagine during the time that I served as mayor.

The most basic things, however, were illustrated by a conference I attended in Indianapolis about two months ago. This group is now called Visit Indy. It used to be just simply called the Tourism and Hotel Bureau. At the conference, Visit Indy described forty years of Unigov. Essentially, when I came into office, the last hotel in downtown Indianapolis was in process of being torn down. There had been mention in the previous mayoral administration of a convention center, and in fact some layout began to occur, but no one really had a very good idea of who would want to come to "Indiana-No-Place." From that stage, we built the first hotel. The Visit Indy people then showed a graph at this meeting, attended by 700 leaders of the city, of a situation of moving from close to zero, to last year convention and tourism and hotel revenue of \$4.4 billion. Over 70,000 jobs are now attributed to this, and 4,700 hotel rooms are hooked together with overpasses to a magnificent convention center so that during the winter, conventioners can literally walk over without having to go outdoors—a great convenience to say the least. This hooks up with the big stadium in which the Indianapolis Colts play football, so that if there are conventions that require seats for 50,000, they are readily available literally across the street from the convention center.

Around the convention center is not only the Colts' stadium but also the Fieldhouse in which the Indiana Pacers play basketball. The Indianapolis

Indians, the minor league baseball club on the other side of the convention center, had the largest attendance of any minor league baseball team in the country last year. There is presently a plan on the other side of White River to put up a soccer stadium that would seat as many as 70,000 people. The mayor has even proposed—and this has been accepted—a much smaller arena for cricket. This has led to some controversy as to what has overcome the mayor. While it is not really certain how many people in Indianapolis are going to play cricket, he points out that a lot of people do play cricket all over the country, and in the same mood of bringing people by the droves to Indianapolis at all hours of the day and night with all the revenue they produce, this is a part of the picture.

At the time that Indianapolis entertained the Super Bowl two years ago, people all over America thoroughly enjoyed the downtown area. We were very lucky weather-wise to have fifty degree days in February, as that is unusual to say the least. The Indianapolis airport, which is a fifteen minute drive, accommodated hundreds of private jets and everybody who flew in for the Super Bowl. Indianapolis is applying again for the Super Bowl in a short period of time with some possibility of receiving that honor again.

I mention this because one of the driving forces for our City-County consolidation, or Unigov, was always idealism and enthusiasm—the sort of enthusiasm you have heard from the mayor and the county executive today. There are no specifically rational points and there is not ever really going to be enough metrics to convince every soul about the whole business of reorganization. But let me just say that when we finished the legislature and Unigov was passed—a pretty short period of time—immediately lawsuits were filed to invalidate the whole thing so the Indiana Supreme Court then had to rule on all of this.

Fortunately, the court ruled in favor of Unigov, which led the opponents to say that the showdown now—the referendum they have always demanded—is going to be Lugar's reelection campaign. My opponent, a very bright young guy, said, "We are for the neighborhoods. We Democrats are not for all this big government business. As a matter of fact, if I am elected, we are going to approach the legislature to repeal this whole business." So the mayoral election of 1971 became a referendum. Interestingly enough, more people voted in the mayoral election in Indianapolis in 1971—over 265,000 people—than have ever voted in any mayoral election since, although the city has grown and the number of eligible voters is substantially more. I won 156,000 to 100,000, so it was a decisive, roughly 60:40 ratio, and that settled it. That was the end of the argument.

We had another term, then, in order to continue the momentum that was already evident, and people enjoyed it more and more. I mention this because there really has to be a political fervor in addition to at least, as I say, the

metrics and the facts. I am not advising one way or another in terms of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. It just so happened that in this particular case, a Republican Party that had revamped itself—it changed its chairman and sold Motors of Indy—was in a building mood and that was very helpful. A wonderful book was written in 1985 called *Governing Metropolitan Indianapolis: The Politics of UniGov*, which I will recommend to those who are working on this problem here at the School of Law. It gives a very detailed description of literally the politics that I described today, as well as the play-by-play of the amendments and how we got to that point.

The final results, however, I think are best illustrated in meetings like the Visit Indy one I just described and likewise by the fact that people enjoy coming to Indianapolis from all different groups. Now there is just a bit of controversy, to say the least, by the fact that Indianapolis successfully will host the NRA convention this year. Some people say, “my goodness, why?” Well some will say, “Well why not? We have the Future Farmers of America every year.” They will say, “Well there is quite a difference between the NRA and Future Farmers,” and indeed there is. Everybody is welcome, and as a matter of fact we manage to accommodate the whole lot—the whole spectrum—as well as the Super Bowl and vie for many more.

There has to be enthusiasm of people wherever they happen to be, location-wise or so forth, for the greater cause—the greater business of St. Louis. Now I sense that that may be occurring here and I am excited about that because of my first visit to St. Louis as a young Rotarian. The tremendous inspiration that I had from foreign affairs, from domestic affairs, from the Senate, and what have you, that arose from hearing those speakers and visiting with Rotarians all over the country made a big difference in my outlook. I had come into a family business to try to save it, not to run for the school board or run for mayor, quite apart from ultimately running for the Senate. These things all evolved in my life because at each point, I saw additional horizons that I thought were very, very important.

I really conclude this by saying that St. Louis and Indianapolis share one aspect that I have thought a lot about this past week. I was in Indianapolis at the University of Indianapolis for a program that had been organized there in which I was invited along with former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia. Senator Nunn was Chairman of the Armed Services Committee during a large period of time that I was Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, although he was a Democrat and I was a Republican, and we argued back and forth when our parties were in power or out of power.

We both were invited by President Ronald Reagan to go to Geneva, Switzerland in 1986, on the first chance that the Soviet Union would be prepared to begin negotiating with us on some degree of arms control of nuclear weapons. The President wisely asked a bipartisan delegation

comprised of sixteen Senators to go to Geneva. He did this knowing that in the Senate you need a two-thirds majority to pass a treaty, and something of that controversy was going to require every bit of bipartisanship that you could summon. In any event, I met Sam there. I had known him in the Senate briefly but we really came together. Though nothing happened in Geneva that year unfortunately, Sam and I continued to meet with Russians that we had seen in the consulate there. We visited Russia and sometimes we saw the Russians in other countries.

I mention all of this because there came a time when the Soviet Union was breaking up. I remember vividly, around a round table in Sam Nunn's office, Sam and I met with a group of Russians that we had known, and they came to us and gave us the word that the security around the nuclear weapons aimed at the United States was breaking down. They told us that the troops could not be paid, that they were deserting, and that that there was a possibility they were going to carry off nuclear material.

In any event, a lot of countries in those days were potentially receptive of this, and the thought was that the people from the armed services were going to try to keep their families alive with that money. So they said, "You folks in the United States may or may not realize it, but the warheads aimed at you may be unguarded by this point." Well that was alarming, to say the least, and we said, "Well what do you want?" They said, "A lot of your money, and furthermore, we want technicians to help take down this stuff. We may even need your troops by the time we are finished in the situation that is in flux."

This was the beginning of the so called Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which goes way beyond consolidation of Indianapolis and Marion County, but into a world in which St. Louis and Indianapolis had things in common. As we got into this business, we passed the Nunn-Lugar Act and I went to Russia along with Sam and others continuously.

One day I went into a silo in Ukraine where they took out a huge missile that had attached to it eight nuclear warheads that were headed for different destinations. We went down to the thirteenth floor of this silo where the guards had been on watch perennially. There were beautiful pictures around the walls of American cities. These were the targets for these nuclear weapons. Well this led me to do some quick research, having been mayor for eight years and being totally oblivious of the fact that we could conceivably have been a target for annihilation. I found we were. So were you in St. Louis.

The fact that we were ignorant of it does not obviate the fact that things go on in the world sometimes quite apart from our local arguments. The Soviets as a matter of fact targeted sufficient nuclear warheads to obliterate every large city in America quite apart from all of our military installations. They had 11,000 warheads, so there were plenty of shots available, and most of them were located on large missiles with eight to twelve per missile. This is what we

call mutually assured destruction, a period of about thirty to forty years in which if mistakes had been made, some horrible things would have happened in both of our countries. As a result, I devoted a great deal of my time and life subsequently to getting rid of all of the Russian missiles and warheads that I could work on. We are down to 1,500 on both sides—U.S. and Russia—as opposed to 11,000 or 12,000. We still have some distance to go to be perfectly safe, although it is a different world altogether at this point.

I mention this because it is sometimes important to try to gain some perspective of the fact that we are in the world, as was expressed by the mayor and the county executive today. We are in a world that is very competitive economically, in which we very much want investment capital from other countries. We want the capital, the jobs it produces, the new products, and the sophistication that comes, but we likewise want to have a much better insight into what people are thinking all over the world at a time when we read in the paper everyday of turmoil in at least a dozen different countries that is going to affect us in one way or another. This means that as opposed to having intramural arguments at home, we really better solidify our idealism as well as our actual content so that we have the most competitive engines for growth, and likewise engines that give opportunities to all of our citizens and are attractive.

I applaud the work that you are thinking about. I hope I have not prejudiced any of the steps that you are taking by this history of the Indianapolis case. But I will just say that just having come over from Indianapolis yesterday, I am excited about what is occurring in my home city. And from what I have heard today, I am excited about what is occurring in St. Louis. I wish you well, I would like to be helpful if I can, and I am honored that you have invited me to be a part of this session. Thank you so very much.